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1. Givón on the rise of agreement

‘Agreement arises via topic-shifting constructions in which the topicalised NP is
coreferential to one argument of the verb. … When a language reanalysed the topic
constituent as the normal subject or object of the neutral, non-topicalised sentence
pattern, it per-force also has reanalyzed subject-topic agreement as subject agreement
and object-topic agreement as object agreement.’ (Givón 1976: 151)

(1) The man, he came.  The man he-came.
   TOPIC   PRO   VERB   SUBJ   AGR-VERB

“I think you should be more explicit here in step two.”
from What’s so Funny about Science? by Sidney Harris (1977)
Three different questions (Givón 2001: 420-1):

(2)  a. Why do contrastive stressed independent pronouns become unstressed – and eventual cliticized – anaphoric pronouns?
    b. Why do anaphoric pronouns cliticize on the verb – rather than on any other word type in the clause?
    c. Why do anaphoric pronouns become obligatorily grammatical agreement in the presence of the full NP?

Givón’s (2001: 421-6) answers:

(3)  a. Because of communicative over-use.
    b. Because the verb is the most likely word to appear in a clause.
    (But how does it get there?)
    c. Through topicalizing constructions: left/right-dislocation.
    (But how does this dislocation gets incorporated in the sentence?)

2. My approach: morpho-syntactic reconstruction

− Investigation of various linguistic families that show a large variability in their usage of person markers (e.g. Munda, Iranian, Uto-Aztecan, Pama-Nyungan).
− Through comparative analysis, a reconstruction of the history is proposed.
− However, the details of such morpho-syntactic reconstruction are highly problematic.
− It is clearly possible to establish morpho-syntactic correspondences (Harris & Campbell 1995: 347 ff.), but it is mostly difficult to extract a direction of change.

3. The languages from Sulawesi

− Jonker (1911) argues for person prefixes as part of the reconstruction of Malayo-Polynesian.
− Esser (Esser 1929) argues that the person prefixes have arisen in some Sulawesi-languages through omzetting, ‘transposition’, from erstwhile suffixes.
− Haaksma (1933) gives an extensive survey, though without arguing for one or the other position.

− Friberg (1991) on South Sulawesi languages (from talk on 5th ICAL).
− Zobel (2002) again proposes a prefixes set to be very old (like Jonker). He thinks of Proto-Nuclear-Malayo-Polynesian, a sister of the Philippine-languages.
4. Stages in the obligatoriness of person marking

Various stages can be found in the Sulawesi languages:

a. clitics only for out-of-focus (‘backgrounded’) arguments
b. possible full arguments together with the clitics for ‘backgrounded’ arguments
c. generalisation to other arguments

4.1 Toratán: rise of ergative person affixes

Free pronoun with ‘Actor Focus’, ergative enclitics directly after verb with non-actor focus. Full subject nouns and subject pronouns occupy the same positions in the verbal clauses either preverbal or sentence final.

(4) Toratán (Himmelmann & Wolff 1999: 31-2, exs. 83, 84)

a. araq sè k<um>ukuk e
   if 3SG <AF>cry_out PART
   ‘When he cried out.’

b. wu yaq nang-aaq kurin
   then 1SG AF-take pot
   ‘Then I fetched a pot.’

c. s<in>are=ku sinapang
   <PST>lean_on=1SG.ERG weapon
   ‘I was leaning on (my) weapon.’

4.2 Uma: strict usage of person affixes

In (5a), the sentence is in ‘Actor Focus’, viz. the sentence is about the actor. The actor is mentioned preverbally and does not get cross-reference on the verb. In (5b), the sentence is in ‘Non-Actor Focus’, viz. the sentence is not about the actor. The actor is cross-referenced on the verb and can be mentioned optionally immediately after the verb (for recoverable information only?).

(5) Uma (Martens 1988a: 243, exs. 18, 19)

a. Ntinapu mpo-wangu tomi-na hi Bulu’
   NAME AF-build house-3SG.POSS at PLACE
   ‘Ntinapu built his house at Bulu’.

b. na-wangu (Ntinapu) tomi-na hi Bulu’
   3SG.ERG-build NAME house-3SG.POSS at PLACE
   ‘Ntinapu built his house at Bulu’.
4.3 Konjo: loss of Actor Focus

Basic order is Verb-intial. There is obligatory cross-reference between verb and following noun phrases. However, topicalised noun phrases in preverbal position do not get cross-reference. A preposed element with cross-reference is possible, though only if it is ‘outside’ the regular sentence structure.

(6) Konjo (Friberg 1996: 140, exs. 1-2)

a. *a’lampa-i (Amir)*
   go-3ABS NAME
   ‘He (Amir) goes.’

b. *Amir a’lampa*
   NAME go
   ‘Amir goes.’

(7) Konjo (Friberg 1996: 141-2, exs. 10-12)

a. *na-kanre-i Amir loka-ku*
   3ERG-eat-3ABS NAME banana-1POSS
   ‘Amir ate my banana.’

b. *Amir ang-kanre-i loka-ku*
   NAME VOICE-eat-3ABS banana-1POSS
   ‘(It is) Amir (who) ate my banana.’

c. *lokaku na-kanre (Amir)*
   banana-1POSS 3ERG-eat NAME
   ‘(It was) my banana he (Amir) ate.’

(8) Konjo (Friberg 1996: 151, ex. 47)

*<manna Baco’, suang-a na-tulung>*

*even NAME BREAK often-1ABS 3ERG-help*

‘Even Baco’, he often helps me.’

Finer (1994; 1997), doing a generative analysis of Salayarese, proposes two different preverbal positions. The position inside the sentence, without cross-reference, is called ‘Focus’ and the position outside the sentence, with cross-reference, is called ‘Topic’. He argues that it is possible to have both positions filled simultaneously.

4.4 Tukang Besi: strict agreement

Complete agreement can be found in Kulisusu (Mead 2002: 167-8), Wolio (van den Berg 1996: 103-5), Muna (van den Berg 1996: 105-7) and Tukang Besi (Donohue 1999). For Tukang Besi, Donohue (1999: 60-1) also distinguished between a ‘focus’ position inside the clause (only open for core arguments) and a ‘topic’ position outside the clause (open for all kind of constituents, followed by an intonation break).
(9) Tukang Besi (Donohue 1999: 51, 60, 61, exs. 1, 31, 35)

a. no-‘ita-’e na kene-no te ana
   3NOM-see-3ACC ART friend-3POSS ART child
   ‘The child saw its friend.’

b. te kene-no no-‘ita-’e te ana
   ART friend-3POSS 3NOM-see-3ACC ART child
   ‘That child saw its friend.’

c. te kene-no, no-‘ita-’e te ana
   ART friend-3POSS BREAK 3NOM-see-3ACC ART child
   ‘That child saw its friend.’

All these three languages (Kulisusu, Muna, Tukang Besi) have also strictly nominative-accusative alignment of the person affixes.

4.5 Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Actor Focus:</th>
<th>non-Actor Focus:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Toratán</td>
<td>no clitics</td>
<td>ergative clitics or full NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uma</td>
<td>no prefix</td>
<td>ergative prefix, addition of NP possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Konjo</td>
<td>no affixes</td>
<td>ergative prefix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tukang Besi</td>
<td>always nominative agreement prefix</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There seems to be a link between the rise of person inflection and the loss of a Philippine-type focus system (cf. Himmelmann 1996). However, the link is not perfect. It appears that the inflection is already there before the focus-system disappears.

‘Double marking’ of participants (full NP and person affix/clitic) first arises in contexts where the referent is ‘backgrounded’. It is only later extended to other contexts. This is rather different as the proposal by Givón.
5. On the attachment of the person affixes to the verb

5.1 Survey of person affixes

Two sets of person enclitics, reconstructable for Proto-Malayo-Polynesian (Ross 2002: 51).

(10) Proto-Malayo-Polynesian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Free</th>
<th>Pivot</th>
<th>Genitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>*[i]aku</td>
<td>=aku</td>
<td>=ku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>*ikahu</td>
<td>=kaw</td>
<td>=mu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG</td>
<td>*[s]iya</td>
<td>=ya</td>
<td>=nia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCL</td>
<td>*[i]kita</td>
<td>=ta</td>
<td>=ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXCL</td>
<td>*[i]kami</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PL</td>
<td>*[i]kamu(-ihu)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PL</td>
<td>*sida</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prefixes are reconstructed by Jonker, though Sulawesi shows an aberrant exclusive prefix (cf. Mead 2002: 174). They are clearly related to the genitive of PMP.

(11) Prefixes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jonker (1911)</th>
<th>Sulawesi prefixes</th>
<th>suffixes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>*ku-</td>
<td>ku-</td>
<td>-ku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>*mu-</td>
<td>mu-</td>
<td>-mu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG</td>
<td>*na-</td>
<td>na-</td>
<td>-na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCL</td>
<td>*ta-</td>
<td>ta-</td>
<td>-ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXCL</td>
<td>*ma-</td>
<td>ki-</td>
<td>-mami/ki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PL</td>
<td>*mi-</td>
<td>mi-</td>
<td>-mi(u)-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PL</td>
<td>*ra-</td>
<td>ra-</td>
<td>-ra</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The southern half of Sulawesi has developed a new suffix set. There might be two independent innovations on the two ‘legs’ of Sulawesi.

(12) Sulawesi ‘absolutive’ suffixes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>South Sulawesi (and some Kaili-Pamona)</th>
<th>Moma and Uma (Kaili-Pamona)</th>
<th>Bungku-Tolaki, Muna-Buton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-aku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>-ko</td>
<td>-ko</td>
<td>-ko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG</td>
<td>-ki</td>
<td>-ta</td>
<td>-kita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCL</td>
<td>-ka(n)</td>
<td>-kami</td>
<td>-kami</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXCL</td>
<td>-ko</td>
<td>-komi</td>
<td>-komiu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2 Structural division of Sulawesi languages

I:  - ergative/possessive suffixes
    - incipient ergative prefixes
    - no absolutive suffixes
   Ia. prefix only in first singular intimate
   Ib. prefix only in first and second singular intimate
   Ic. complete set of prefixes

II:  - complete set of ergative prefixes
    - complete set of absolutive suffixes
    - ergative/possessive suffixes restricted use for argument cross-referencing
    - incipient nominative usage of prefixes
   IIa. exclusive -ta suffix, floating suffixes
   IIb. exclusive -ki suffix, floating suffixes
   IIc. exclusive -kita suffix, floating prefixes

III:  - nominative prefixes
    - accusative suffixes
    - no floating of affixes

5.3 Origin of prefixes

Which languages show the situation closest to the historical origin? Problem of establishing the direction of the arrow in morpho-syntactic reconstruction.

1) Himmelmann (1996): Original Wackernagel clitics, then enclitics are attracted to head, then movement to prefixes starting with first/second person (cf. Esser’s (1927) omzetting ‘transposition’).
2) Resemblance with possessive suffixes: most clearly in South Sulawesi.
3) Variable attachment in Bungku-Tolaki (see below).
4) Maybe very old prefixes (Jonker 1911, Zobel 2002).

Bungku-Tolaki shows some conservative features:
a. prefixes are sometimes found as wackernagel suffixes
b. ‘possessive’ suffixes are still used for argument cross-reference

Ad A.) Ergative prefixes (related to the ku/mu/na-series) sometimes found as Wackernagel enclitic, typically after:
   - negation
   - conditional particles
   - clause linking particles

Is there a reason to consider these conservative structures?

- Padoe (Vuorinen 1995: 109): ako (‘because’), ba (‘if’, ‘when’), ka (‘so that’), la (negation), aambo (‘not yet’)
- Tolaki (Mead 2002: 158): ke (‘if’), a (‘and’, ‘so that’)
- Moronene (Andersen 1999: 80): ka (‘then’), ki (‘if’), ha (‘whenever’), hi (complementizer), taba (‘how!’), na, sa (negation)
Padoe (Vuorinen 1995: 107, 109, ex. 54, 66, 68)

a. *umari* sie *ku-nahu-o*
   finish that 1SG-cook-3SG
   ‘After that I cooked it.’

b. *la-ku* to’ori-*o* name-*no*
   NEG-1SG know-3SG name-3SG.POSS
   ‘I do not know his name.’

c. *la-u* huru *kee l<um>eko ndi dotoro*
   NEG-2SG ever Q <VOICE>go to doctor
   ‘Have you not gone to a doctor?’

Ad B.) Possessive suffixes (also related to the *ku/mu/na*-series, though synchronically different from the ergative prefixes) used sometimes for argument marking. Could these be left-overs from erstwhile ergative suffixes? Note that the passive infix <in> is related to an original non-actor-focus infix.

- Padoe (Vuorinen 1995: 106): agent of passive verbs
- Mori (Barsel 1994: 60-1): agent of passive verb, intial adverbial clause
- Tolaki (Mead 2002: 158-60): some intransitive verbs

() Mori (Barsel 1994: 60, ex. 4.49)

    o manu p<in>oweę-do mia mota’u
    ? chicken <PASS>give-3PL.POSS people years

    ‘A chicken as given by the elders.’

5.4 Origin of nominative marking

Subjects of intransitives is often marked by the prefix in specific contexts (‘split ergative’). This mainly happens in South Sulawesi and Bungku-Tolaki. It appears to be an intermediate stage to the full nominative/accusative system in Muna-Buton. Two examples:

Tolaki (Bungku-Tolaki, Mead 2002: 156-8) nominative marking after:

- imperative
- negative
- consessive *ke* (‘if’)
- sequential *a* (‘and, so that’)
- scene setting at the beginning of narrative
- certain complement clauses
- durative
Duri (South Sulawesi, Valkama 1995: 58-62) nominative marking after:

- prohibitive *danggiq*
- negative *teqda*
- conditionals: subordinating *ia-na* (‘if’), *sanggen-na* (‘until’), *ia ton-na* (‘when’)
- sequential: after consecutive proclitic *na-*, *dikua* (‘so that’), *ia-mo* (therefore), AF with close tie to preceding sentence
- scene setting: after certain time phrases
- interrogative: after question clitic =*ka*, with WH-items *umbo* (‘where’), *ciapari* (‘why’), *piran* (‘when’)

These contexts also seem related to the notion ‘irrealis’ as summarised in Elliot (2000). There is a proposal by van den Berg (1996) to reconstruct the person prefixes in Sulawesi only for ‘irrealis’ (note that he does not elucidate the precise contexts which use irrealis). Tentatively, I propose that with the extension of the prefixes to other contexts, the irrealis-contexts turned to nominative (why?).

This development is still rather unclear

6. Conclusions

- Morphosyntactic historical-comparative work is possible: interpret differences as signs of change
- The most difficult part it the establishment of direction of change
- Morphosyntactic features appear to show massive diffusion/borrowing

- ‘Agreement’ of person affixes first appears with ‘backgrounded’ arguments
- Irrealis contexts (negation, imperative, interrogative, conditionals) are conservative?
- How do consecutive clauses and scene setting clauses fit in there?
Sources for the languages investigated

Sangir-Minahasan
11 Tondano (Sneddon 1975)
12 Ratahan/Toratán (Himmelmann & Wolff 1999)

Tomini-Tolitoli
21 Tolitoli (Himmelmann 1996, 2002)
22 Lauje (Himmelmann 2002)
23 Pendau (Quick 2002)

Kaili-Pamona
31 Ledo (Esser 1934)
32 Da’a (Barr 1988a, b)
33 Moma/Kulawi (van den Berg 1996: 99-102, citing Adriani & Esser 1939)
34 Napu (ten Kate 1915)
35 Uma (Martens 1988c, a, b)
36 Bada/Besoa (Haaksma 1933: 89-90, citing Adriani & Kruyt 1914)
37 Pamona/Bare’e (Adriani 1909, 1931)
38 Rampi/Leboni (Haaksma 1933: 90-92, citing Adriani & Kruyt 1914)

South Sulawesi
41 Seko Padang (Laskowske 1994; Payne & Laskowske 1997)
42 Mamuju (Stromme 1994)
43 Mamasa (Matti 1994)
44 Duri (Valkama 1995)
45 Bugis (Matthes 1875; Sirk 1983)
46 Makasar (Matthes 1858)
47 Konjo (Friberg 1996)
48 Selayarese (Finer 1994, 1997)

Bungku-Tolaki
51 Mori (Esser 1927, 1933; Barsel 1994)
52 Padoe (Vuorinen 1995)
53 Tolaki (Mead 2002: 156-161)
54 Moronene (Andersen 1999)
55 Kulisusu (Mead 2002: 167-170)

Muna-Buton
61 Muna (van den Berg 1989, 1991)
62 Wolio (Anceaux 1952)
63 Tukang Besi (Donohue 1999)

Saluan-Banggai
71 Banggai (van den Bergh 1953)
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